

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In response, the claims are amended for definiteness. Initially, the indication that claims 11-13 are allowable is appreciatively noted. These claims are retained.

Amended new claims 1, 15 define that the compression ratio of the fluid is not more than $3.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{cm}^2/\text{Kg}$. This compression ratio recites a fluid which has low compressibility. Therefore, the fluid pressure can be easily increased, even using a small amount of fluid compression. The fluid pressure, for example, can be increased to approximately 300 through 500 MPa. As a result, the stroke of the movable die or the upper die can be reduced. In addition, processing time which is required can be shortened. This explanation is described in P5L7-P5L9, P5L20-P5L23, P8L1-P8L2 and P19L22 of the specification.

Dependent claims 3, 19 define that the viscosity of the fluid can be between 100 to 1500 cSt. Therefore, the leakage of the fluid between the workpiece and the fixed die, or the top end section of the lower die can be prevented, even if the fluid

pressure becomes high. This explanation is described in the specification P5L11-P5L14.

Dependent claims 4, 20 define that the fluid is a mixture of glycol and water. Further, dependent claims 22, 23 define that the mixed volume ratio of the glycol to water is 9~6 to 1~4. This mixed volume ratio, maintains the compression ratio of the fluid at not more than $3.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{cm}^2/\text{Kg}$. Also, the viscosity of the fluid can be between 100 to 1500 cSt. This explanation is described in the specification P15L10-P15L14.

The cited prior art (DE 19717953, JP 2001-259752, US 4794774) do not disclose a fluid having the compression ratio and the viscosity as described above. Accordingly, the amended claims 1 and 15 overcome the Claim Rejection 35 USC 102(b) and 103(a).

Each of the dependent claims should be allowable for similar reasons.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.


Attorney Docket No. 15468-005001
Serial No. 10/687,412
Amendment dated July 9, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated March 16, 2004

Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account
No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2004



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10409031.doc